arXiv:1512.00227v2 [q-fin.MF] 18 Feb 2016

A FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYZING STOCHASTIC JUMPS IN FINANCE BASED ON BELIEF AND KNOWLEDGE

TAKANORI ADACHI

Abstract. We introduce a formal language **IE** that is a variant of the language **PAL** developed in [vB11] by adding a belief operator and a common belief operator, specializing to stochastic analysis. A constant symbol in the language denotes a stochastic process so that we can represent several financial events as formulae in the language, which is expected to be clues of analyzing the moments that some stochastic jumps such as financial crises occur based on knowledge and belief of individuals or those shared within groups of individuals. In order to represent beliefs, we use σ-complete Boolean algebras as generalized σ-algebras. We use the representation for constructing a model in which the interpretations of the formulae written in the language **IE** reside. The model also uses some new categories for integrating several components appeared in the theory into one.

1. Introduction

When predicting the timing of financial credit risk events, it would be better if we can forecast them with a *structural approach* rather than just analyzing them in a reduced-form manner since the structural approach may show us the mechanism how the events happen as well as their timing. However, it seems that the structural approach does not work so well so far for forecasting risk events just like that we cannot forecast earthquakes very well. But comparing with earthquakes is a fair excuse?

One of the main differences between financial risk events and natural disasters is that the former are triggered by an aggregation of *human speculation* while the others are independent of it.

In order to handle human speculation, we already have a theory of *utility functions* that represent *human preferences*. But,it is somehow too simple to represent *human beliefs* and their changes since preferences may be results of accumulated individual beliefs.

Date: February 19, 2016.

JEL Classification. C02, D81, D83 .

Key words and phrases. stochastic process, stochastic jump, epistemic logic, doxastic logic, belief operator, decision theory .

This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 26330026.

If we try to handle the beliefs one by one, we need a technique of processing them and a theory of analyzing them. We have and will have a better technique of handling *big data* with high speed computer systems these days that will help for solving the former issue. So the remaining is the theory.

In this paper, we will present a framework for developing such a theory by providing a *language* that is capable of describing financial phenomena and a *model* for interpreting it based on *measure-theoretic* probability theory so that we can apply it to many assets in mathematical finance we have developed.

Trying to make languages handle knowledge and belief is not new. Actually, they have been developed in the theories of epistemic and doxastic logic as modal operators, starting with a seminal book [Hin62]. The theories provide models of the languages, and some of them are based on probabilistic interpretation. However, the probability theory used there is not based on measure theory and do not fit to applications using modern stochastic theory, such as mathematical finance theory.

In this paper, we extend the language so that it can handle stochastic processes and give a model based on measure theoretic probability theory with a help of category theory.

Let us see an example of formula that we can represent in our language.

$$(\mathbf{B}_j(X(\nu) \geq p)) \wedge (\mathbf{B}_k(X(\nu) \leq p)) \tag{1.1}$$

where X is (a name of) a stochastic process representing a value movement of some stock, ν is a built-in constant denoting "now", p is a specified price, and j and k are agents. We read this formula as "*the agent j believes that the current value of the stock is more than or equal to p, while the agent k believes that it is less than or equal to p*". If the formula is true, there may happen a trade between j and k, that is, the agent j may sell some amount of the stock to the agent k at the price p.

In this paper, we will provide a model with which we can evaluate the formula. Here is a formula for the evaluation.

$$i, \omega, t \models_{0.05} (\mathbf{B}_j(X(\nu) \geq p)) \wedge (\mathbf{B}_k(X(\nu) \leq p)) \tag{1.2}$$

This says that "*The agent (an observer) i at state ω and time t evaluates (1.1) 95% valid*".

Here is another example.

$$i, \omega, t \models_{0.1} \mathbf{CB}_G(V(\nu + 1) \geq \ell) \tag{1.3}$$

where V is (a name of) a stochastic process representing some firm's value, ℓ is its liabilities, and G is a set of agents (of concerned parties).

This says that "*The agent i at state ω and time t evaluates that it is a common belief among G that the firm's value at $t+1$ is more than or equal to ℓ with 90% degree of certainty*". When the common belief breaks down, it may be a point of starting a credit risk event.

In both examples, we have clues of analyzing the moments that some jumps occur based on *belief*, which may be a new perspective of microeconomics or credit risk theory.

In Section 2, we will introduce a formal language **IE** that can depict the situations we are interested in financial markets including (1.2) and (1.3). In order to interpret formulae written in the language, we need to understand what knowledge and belief are in our setting. Section 3 provides a solution to it by using σ-complete Boolean algebras. After introducing few categories as a preparation in Section 4, we give an interpretation of **IE** in Section 5.

For those who are not so familiar with Language theory and Category theory, please consult [vB11] and [Mac97], respectively.

2. The Language IE

Let $\mathcal{T}$ be a time domain with the least time 0. All the discussions in this paper are on a filtered measurable space

$$(\Omega, \mathcal{G}, \mathbb{G} = \{\mathcal{G}_t\}_{t\in\mathcal{T}}) \tag{2.1}$$

that satisfies $\mathcal{G} = \bigvee_{t\in\mathcal{T}} \mathcal{G}_t$.

Definition 2.1. Let $\mathbf{I}$ be a non-empty finite set of *individuals* or *agents*.

For a set A, an **IE-*formula***[1] on A is defined inductively by the following BNF notation[2].

$$\varphi ::= m_1 \le m_2 \mid \neg\varphi \mid \varphi \wedge \psi \mid \mathbf{K}_i\varphi \mid \mathbf{CK}_G\varphi \mid \mathbf{B}_i\varphi \mid \mathbf{CB}_G\varphi$$

where m_1 and m_2 are *terms*[3], $i \in \mathbf{I}$, $G \subset \mathbf{I}$, and φ and ψ are **IE**-formulae. The formula $m_1 \le m_2$ is called a ***primitive formula***, $\mathbf{IE}(A)$ is the set of all **IE**-formulae on A.

Now we explain the intended meaning of the four modal operators $\mathbf{K}_i$, $\mathbf{CK}_G$, $\mathbf{B}_i$ and $\mathbf{CB}_G$ one by one.

$\mathbf{K}_i\varphi$ (i *knows* that φ),
$\mathbf{CK}_G\varphi$ (φ is a *common knowledge* in the group G),
$\mathbf{B}_i\varphi$ (i *believes* that φ),
$\mathbf{CB}_G\varphi$ (φ is a *common belief* in the group G).

[1] **IE** stands for *InEquality*.
[2] Backus-Naur Form
[3] Terms will be defined in Definition 2.2.

Before going into the detail of the theory, we will provide a crux of the language theory. The important point here is to distinguish *syntax* and *semantics* clearly. Syntax is about a mere sequence of symbols that does not say anything about its meaning, while semantics is about a real world in which the sequence determined by the syntax is interpreted.

Here is a figure explaining the situation.



For example, a stochastic process X is mapped to a constant symbol c_X that is a *name* of X, and the sequence of symbols $\neg\phi$ is interpreted as the value $1-[\![\varphi]\!]_{\mathbf{h}}$ using the (already computed) interpretation $[\![\varphi]\!]_{\mathbf{h}}$ of φ.

First of all, as a component of the language **IE**, we see the syntax and the semantics of *terms* appeared in Definition 2.1.

Here is its syntax.

Definition 2.2. Let X be a $\mathtt{G}$-adapted process, $r \in \mathtt{R}$, and $f : \mathtt{R}^k \to \mathtt{R}$ be a predefined measurable function. Then, a ***term*** m is defined inductively by:

$$m ::= c_r \mid \nu \mid c_X(m) \mid c_f(m_1, \dots, m_k)$$

Then, its semantics is provided as following.

Definition 2.3. The values of a term m is a *stochastic process* $[\![m]\!]$ defined by

(1) $[\![c_r]\!](t) := r$,
(2) $[\![\nu]\!](t) := t$,
(3) $[\![c_X(m)]\!](t) := X([\![m]\!](t))$,
(4) $[\![c_f(m_1, \dots, m_k)]\!](t) := f([\![m_1]\!](t), \dots, [\![m_k]\!](t))$.

In order to give semantics for all **IE**-formulae, we need some considerations about knowledge and belief as well as domains of their models.

We sometimes write simply a for c_a. We allow the following abbreviations as *syntactic sugar* for **IE**-formulae.

$$\begin{aligned} m_1 = m_2 &\equiv (m_1 \leq m_2) \wedge (m_2 \leq m_1), \\ m_1 \neq m_2 &\equiv \neg(m_1{=}m_2), \\ m_1 < m_2 &\equiv (m_1 \leq m_2) \wedge (m_1{\neq}m_2), \\ m_1 \geq m_2 &\equiv \neg(m_1 < m_2), \\ m_1 > m_2 &\equiv \neg(m_1 \leq m_2), \\ \varphi \vee \psi &\equiv \neg((\neg\varphi) \wedge (\neg\psi)), \\ \varphi \to \psi &\equiv (\neg\varphi) \vee \psi, \\ \varphi \leftrightarrow \psi &\equiv (\varphi \to \psi) \wedge (\psi \to \varphi). \end{aligned}$$

The set $\mathbf{IE}(A)$ is just like a *free algebra* generated by A. In that sense, the following functor $\mathbf{IE} : \mathbf{Set} \to \mathbf{Set}$ can become a *monad*.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathbf{Set} & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{IE}} & \mathbf{Set} & & \\ & & & & \\ A & \longmapsto & \mathbf{IE}(A) & \ni & \varphi \\ \Big\downarrow{\scriptstyle f} & & \Big\downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathbf{IE}(f)} & & \Big\downarrow \\ B & \longmapsto & \mathbf{IE}(B) & \ni & \mathbf{IE}(f)(\varphi) \end{array}$$

where $\mathbf{IE}(f)(\varphi)$ is the **IE**-formula on B that we get by substituting all occurrences of the form c_a in φ by $c_{f(a)}$.

3. How to Represent Knowledge and Belief

3.1. **Knowledge and Belief.** In this subsection, we require an extra assumption that the cardinality of Ω is finite. But, this requirement is just for explaining our motivation described below, and is not necessary in general.

Let $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{G}$ be a sub-σ-algebra of $\mathcal{G}$.

Since Ω is a finite set, a σ-algebra $\mathcal{F}$ defines a partition of Ω whose equivalence classes are of the form

$$[\omega]_{\mathcal{F}} := \bigcap \{A \in \mathcal{F} \mid \omega \in A\}$$

from which we can recover the original σ-algebra.

Then, we read this situation as

" According to the knowledge $\mathcal{F}$, we cannot distinguish two (fundamental) events ω_1 and ω_2 in Ω if $[\omega_1]_{\mathcal{F}} = [\omega_2]_{\mathcal{F}}$." Therefore, if we say that we know something at state ω, then it means that we recognize

that it is true in all states ω' in $[\omega]_{\mathcal{F}}$. In other words, the smaller the set $[\omega]_{\mathcal{F}}$ is the more certainly we know it.

So, we regard a σ-algebra as a representation of knowledge.

Now let us go forward to the belief issue. Plato said, *knowledge = justified true belief*. The proverb suggests that the clear-cut boundary between different equivalence classes $[\omega_1]_{\mathcal{F}}$ and $[\omega_2]_{\mathcal{F}}$ specified by the knowledge $\mathcal{F}$ needs to be blurry when making it a representation of belief.

Since a subset A of Ω can be identified with its characteristic function:

$$A : \Omega \to \{0, 1\}, \tag{3.1}$$

we can think a σ-algebra as a set of characteristic functions.

Now let us try to generalize the range of (3.1) in order to introduce blur.

A candidate is a σ-complete Boolean algebra.

3.2. **σ-complete Boolean algebras.** In this subsection, we will give a review of Boolean algebras. People who want to see more detail, please refer to [Sik69].

Definition 3.1. A ***Boolean algebra*** is a structure

$$(B, 0, 1, \wedge, \vee, \neg),$$

where B is a set, $0, 1 \in B$, $\wedge$ and $\vee$ are binary operations on B and $\neg$ is a unary operation on B, satisfying the following conditions called the ***Boolean laws***.

(1) $x \wedge x = x, \quad x \vee x = x,$
(2) $x \wedge y = y \wedge x, \quad x \vee y = y \vee x,$
(3) $x \wedge (y \wedge z) = (x \wedge y) \wedge z, \quad x \vee (y \vee z) = (x \vee y) \vee z,$
(4) $x \wedge (x \vee y) = x \vee (x \wedge y) = x,$
(5) $x \wedge (y \vee z) = (x \wedge y) \vee (x \wedge z), \quad x \vee (y \wedge z) = (x \vee y) \wedge (x \vee z),$
(6) $x \vee 0 = x, \quad x \wedge 1 = x,$
(7) $x \wedge 0 = 0, \quad x \vee 1 = 1,$
(8) $x \wedge \neg x = 0, \quad x \vee \neg x = 1,$
(9) $\neg\neg x = x,$
(10) $\neg(x \wedge y) = \neg x \vee \neg y, \quad \neg(x \vee y) = \neg x \wedge \neg y.$

It is easy to show that for every pair of elements $x, y \in B$ of a Boolean algebra, we have

$$x \wedge y = x \;\Leftrightarrow\; x \vee y = y. \tag{3.2}$$

We write this situation by $x \leq y$. Then, the structure $(B, \leq)$ becomes a partilly ordered set.

Definition 3.2. A Boolean algebra $(B, 0, 1, \wedge, \vee, \neg)$ is called ***σ-complete*** if for all index sets I and J with

$$|I|, |J| \leq \aleph_0,$$

there exist elements of B

$$\bigwedge_{i \in I} x_i \quad \text{and} \quad \bigvee_{i \in I} x_i$$

such that

$$\bigwedge_{i \in (I \cup J)} x_i = (\bigwedge_{i \in I} x_i) \wedge (\bigwedge_{i \in J} x_i)$$

and

$$\bigvee_{i \in (I \cup J)} x_i = (\bigvee_{i \in I} x_i) \vee (\bigvee_{i \in J} x_i).$$

We now have some examples of σ-complete Boolean algebras.

(1) $\mathbf{2} = \{0, 1\}$ is a σ-complete Boolean algebra with the standard Boolean operation, where 0 and 1 stand for false and true, respectively.

(2) For a set Ω, Any σ-algebra $\mathcal{G} \subset 2^\Omega$ is a σ-complete Boolean algebra with the set-operations like for every $A, B \in \mathcal{G}$,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &:= \emptyset, \\ 1 &:= \Omega, \\ A \wedge B &:= A \cap B, \\ A \vee B &:= A \cup B, \\ \neg A &:= \Omega - A. \end{aligned}$$

(3) Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{G}, \mu)$ be a measure space. Then, the quotient set

$$\mathcal{G} / \sim_\mu$$

is a σ-complete Boolean algebra, where $\sim_\mu$ is the equivalence relation on $\mathcal{G}$ defined by

$$S \sim_\mu T \ \Leftrightarrow \ \mu(S \triangle T) = 0$$

for $S, T \in \mathcal{G}$.

(4) Let Ω be a set, and B be a σ-complete Boolean algebra. Then, the function space

$$B^\Omega$$

becomes a σ-complete Boolean algebra by extending Boolean operations in pointwise manner.

We will use a sub-σ-complete Boolean algebra $\mathcal{F} \subset B^\Omega$ as a generalized or blurred σ-algebra later.

Definition 3.3. The category $\sigma\mathbf{BA}$ is defined by:

(1) **objects** := all non-degenerate[4] σ-complete Boolean algebras,
(2) $\sigma\mathbf{BA}(A, B)$:= all Boolean structure-preserving functions from A to B, that is, the function f satisfying
  (a) $f(0) = 0$,
  (b) $f(\bigwedge_{i\in I} x_i) = \bigwedge_{i\in I} f(x_i)$,
  (c) $f(\bigvee_{i\in I} x_i) = \bigvee_{i\in I} f(x_i)$,
  (d) $f(\neg x) = \neg f(x)$.

Proposition 3.4. *Let $b : B \to \mathbf{2}$ be an arrow in $\sigma\mathbf{BA}$. Then,*

(1) $b^{-1}(1)$ is a ultrafilter of B,
(2) $b^{-1}(0)$ is a prime ideal of B,
(3) $\mathbf{2}$ is the initial object of $\sigma\mathbf{BA}$.
  That is, for every object $B \in \sigma\mathbf{BA}$, there exists one and only one arrow $!_B : \mathbf{2} \to B$.

3.3. **Anchoring of generalized σ-algebras.** Now we proceed to introduce an important concept of *anchoring*.

Let $\mathtt{B}$ be a σ-complete Boolean algebra, and $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathtt{B}^\Omega$ be a subalgebra (sub-σ-complete Boolean algebra). We regard this $\mathcal{F}$ as a *generalized* σ-algebra.

Definition 3.5. [Anchoring]

(1) An ***anchor*** or a ***belief*** from $\mathbf{B}$ is an order-preserving arrow $a : \mathtt{B} \to \mathbf{2}$ such that $a(0) = 0$ and $a(1) = 1$.
  We write the set of all anchors from $\mathbf{B}$ by $\mathcal{A}_\mathbf{B}$.
(2) For a non-empty subset $A \subset \mathcal{A}_\mathbf{B}$,
$$\mathcal{F}/A := \{u \in \mathbf{2}^\Omega \mid \exists k \in \mathcal{F},\, \forall a \in A\, [u = a \circ k]\}.$$
$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Omega & \xrightarrow{\ k\ } & \mathtt{B} \\ & {\scriptstyle u}\searrow \quad \swarrow{\scriptstyle a} & \\ & \mathbf{2} & \end{array}$$
(3) For $a \in \mathcal{A}_\mathbf{B}$, $\mathcal{F}/a := \mathcal{F}/\{a\}$.

Proposition 3.6. *Let $A_1, A_2 \subset \mathcal{A}_\mathbf{B}$ be non-empty subsets.*

(1) If $A_1 \subset A_2$, then $\mathcal{F}/A_1 \supset \mathcal{F}/A_2$.

(2) $\mathcal{F}/\mathcal{A}_\mathbf{B} = \{1_{\mathcal{A}_\mathbf{B}} \circ k \mid k \in \mathcal{F}$ and $\forall\omega \in \Omega[k(\omega) = 0_\mathtt{B}$ or $1_\mathtt{B}]\}$.

For a given (blurred) information $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathtt{B}^\Omega$, we see
$$\mathcal{F}/\mathcal{A}_\mathbf{B}$$
as a representation of knowledge, while we see
$$\mathcal{F}/a$$

[4] A Boolean algebra is called ***degenerate*** if $0 = 1$.

as a representation of belief where you may change your mind (or belief) by choosing $a \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{B}}$.

Definition 3.7. The category $\chi_{\mathcal{F}} := \chi_{\mathcal{F}}(\Omega)$ is defined by:

(1) **objects** := all triples $(B, \mathcal{F}, a)$ of an object B of $\sigma\mathbf{BA}$, a sub-σ-complete Boolean algebra $\mathcal{F} \subset B^{\Omega}$, and an anchor $a : B \to \mathbf{2}$ in $\sigma\mathbf{BA}$,
(2) $\chi_{\mathcal{F}}((B_1, \mathcal{F}_1, a_1), (B_2, \mathcal{F}_2, a_2)) :=$
$\{u \in \sigma\mathbf{BA}(B_1, B_2) \mid u\mathcal{F}_1 \subset \mathcal{F}_2 \text{ and } a_1 = a_2 \circ u\}$
where $u\mathcal{F} := \{u \circ f \mid f \in \mathcal{F}\}$.



Note that $\chi_{\mathcal{F}}((\mathbf{2}, \mathcal{F}_1, !_{\mathbf{2}}), (\mathbf{2}, \mathcal{F}_2, !_{\mathbf{2}}))$ has at most one element, and that $\chi_{\mathcal{F}}((\mathbf{2}, \mathcal{F}_1, !_{\mathbf{2}}), (\mathbf{2}, \mathcal{F}_2, !_{\mathbf{2}})) \neq \emptyset$ iff $\mathcal{F}_1 \subset \mathcal{F}_2$.

In the definition of arrows in $\chi_{\mathcal{F}}$, We use one arrow $u : B_1 \to B_2$ in order to make restrictions for both $u\mathcal{F}_1 \subset \mathcal{F}_2$ and $a_1 = a_2 \circ u$. But the second equation means that a_1 is determined by a_2 once u is specified according to the first equation, which may be too restrictive.

Here is another arrow definition of $\chi_{\mathcal{F}}$ for removing the restriction:

$\chi_{\mathcal{F}}((B_1, \mathcal{F}_1, a_1), (B_2, \mathcal{F}_2, a_2)) := \{$ // Non-adopted version
$(u, v) \in \sigma\mathbf{BA}(B_1, B_2) \times \sigma\mathbf{BA}(B_1, B_2) \mid$
$u\mathcal{F}_1 \subset \mathcal{F}_2$ and $a_1 = a_2 \circ v$
$\}$.



However, this version of $\chi_{\mathcal{F}}$ will fail to make the following correspondence $\mathcal{B}$ a functor, so we do not adopt this extended version.

Definition 3.8. [Category $\sigma\mathbf{Alg}_{\Omega}$] The category $\sigma\mathbf{Alg}_{\Omega}$ is defined by:

(1) **objects** := all σ-algebra over Ω
(2) $\sigma\mathbf{Alg}_{\Omega}(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2)$ has exactly one arrow if $\mathcal{F}_1 \subset \mathcal{F}_2$, otherwise empty.

Definition 3.9. [Knowledge Functor $\mathcal{K}$] The functor $\mathcal{K}$ is defined by the following diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \chi_{\mathcal{F}} & \xrightarrow{\quad\mathcal{K}\quad} & \sigma\mathbf{Alg}_{\Omega} \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} B_1 & & (B_1,\mathcal{F}_1,a_1) \longmapsto \mathcal{F}_1/\mathcal{A}_{B_1} \\ {\scriptstyle f_1}\nearrow \quad \downarrow{\scriptstyle u} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle u} \qquad\qquad \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathcal{K}(u)} \\ \Omega \qquad\quad B_2 & & (B_2,\mathcal{F}_2,a_2) \longmapsto \mathcal{F}_2/\mathcal{A}_{B_2} \\ {\scriptstyle f_2}\searrow & & \end{array}$$

Definition 3.10. [Belief Functor $\mathcal{B}$] The functor $\mathcal{B}$ is defined by the following diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \chi_{\mathcal{F}} & \xrightarrow{\quad\mathcal{B}\quad} & \sigma\mathbf{Alg}_{\Omega} \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} B_1 & & (B_1,\mathcal{F}_1,a_1) \longmapsto \mathcal{F}_1/a_1 \\ {\scriptstyle f_1}\nearrow \quad \downarrow{\scriptstyle u} \quad \searrow{\scriptstyle a_1} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle u} \qquad\qquad \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathcal{B}(u)} \\ \Omega \qquad\quad \mathbf{2} & & \\ {\scriptstyle f_2}\searrow \quad \nearrow{\scriptstyle a_2} & & \\ B_2 & & (B_2,\mathcal{F}_2,a_2) \longmapsto \mathcal{F}_2/a_2 \end{array}$$

Note that there is a natural transformation

$$\mathcal{K} \dot{\to} \mathcal{B}$$

that represents natural inclusion arrows.

4. More Categories

The following categories were introduced in [Ada14] though the category $\chi_{\mathcal{F}}(\Omega)$ in this paper is an extended version.

Definition 4.1. [Categories $\chi_{\mathtt{P}}$ and χ]

(1) $\chi_{\mathtt{P}} := \chi_{\mathtt{P}}(\mathcal{G})$
   (a) **objects** := the set of all probability measures defined on $(\Omega,\mathcal{G})$,
   (b) $\chi_{\mathtt{P}}(\mu,\nu)$ has exactly one arrow if $\mu \gg \nu$, otherwise empty,
   where $\mu \gg \nu$ means that ν is absolutely continuous to μ.

(2) $\chi := \chi(\Omega,\mathcal{G}) := \chi_{\mathcal{F}}(\Omega) \times \chi_{\mathtt{P}}(\mathcal{G})$.
   For an object $\mathcal{U} \in \chi$, we write

$$\mathcal{U} =: ((\mathtt{B}_{\mathcal{U}}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{U}}, a_{\mathcal{U}}), \mathtt{P}_{\mathcal{U}}).$$

(3) For an object $\mathcal{U} \in \chi$,

$$\mathcal{K}_{\mathcal{U}} := \mathcal{K}(p_1(\mathcal{U})), \quad \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{U}} := \mathcal{B}(p_1(\mathcal{U})).$$

where $p_1 : \chi \to \chi_{\mathcal{F}}$ is a projection functor.

Definition 4.2. [Functor $\mathtt{L}_{\mathcal{F}}$] The functor $\mathtt{L}_{\mathcal{F}}$ is defined by the following diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \sigma\mathbf{Alg}_{\Omega} & \xrightarrow{\mathtt{L}_{\mathcal{F}}} & \mathbf{Set} \\ \mathcal{F}_1 & \longmapsto & \mathtt{L}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{F}_1) := L^{\infty}(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_1) \\ {\scriptstyle *}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathtt{L}_{\mathcal{F}}(*)} \\ \mathcal{F}_2 & \longmapsto & \mathtt{L}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{F}_2) := L^{\infty}(\Omega, \mathcal{F}_2) \end{array}$$

Definition 4.3. We regard the set $\mathcal{T}$ with the natural total order as a category.

Definition 4.4. An object of the functor category $\chi_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mathcal{T}}$ is called a ***filtration***.

Definition 4.5. The functor $(\mathtt{L}_{\mathcal{F}} \circ \mathcal{B})^{\mathcal{T}}$ makes the following diagram commute.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \chi_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mathcal{T}} & \xrightarrow{(\mathtt{L}_{\mathcal{F}} \circ \mathcal{B})^{\mathcal{T}}} & \mathbf{Set}^{\mathcal{T}} \\ f & \longmapsto & \mathtt{L}_{\mathcal{F}} \circ \mathcal{B} \circ f := \prod_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \mathtt{L}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{B}(f(t))) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ g & \longmapsto & \mathtt{L}_{\mathcal{F}} \circ \mathcal{B} \circ g := \prod_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \mathtt{L}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{B}(g(t))) \end{array}$$

An element of $\mathtt{L}_{\mathcal{F}} \circ \mathcal{B} \circ f$ is called an ***f-adapted process***.

5. An Interpretation of IE

Definition 5.1. [Category $\mathbf{I}$]

(1) We regard the set $\mathbf{I}$ of agents as a discrete category, that is, a category whose objects are elements of the set $\mathbf{I}$, but it has no arrows except identities.

(2) The function $\rho : 2^{\mathbf{I}} \to [0, 1]$ is a probability measure on $(\mathbf{I}, 2^{\mathbf{I}})$.

Definition 5.2. [Histories] A ***history*** is a functor from $\mathbf{I}$ to $\chi^{\mathcal{T}}$.

Let $\mathbf{h} : \mathbf{I} \to \chi^{\mathcal{T}}$ be a history. Then, for $i \in \mathbf{I}$ and $t \in \mathcal{T}$, we have an object of χ like

$$\mathbf{h}(i)(t) = ((\mathtt{B}_{\mathbf{h}(i)(t)}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{h}(i)(t)}, a_{\mathbf{h}(i)(t)}), \mathtt{P}_{\mathbf{h}(i)(t)}).$$

Definition 5.3. Let $\mathbf{h} : \mathbf{I} \to \chi^{\mathcal{T}}$ be a history

(1) A history $\mathbf{h}$ is called ***pre-G-adapted*** if for every $i \in \mathbf{I}$ and $t \in \mathcal{T}$,

$$\mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{h}(i)(t)} \subset \mathtt{G}(t).$$

(2) A pre-$\mathtt{G}$-adapted history $\mathbf{h}$ is called $\mathtt{G}$***-adapted*** if for every $i \in \mathbf{I}$ and $t \in \mathcal{T}$,

$$\mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{h}(i)(t)} \subset \mathtt{G}(t).$$

Definition 5.4. [An Interpretation of **IE** formulae]

Let $\mathbf{h} : \mathbf{I} \to \chi^{\mathcal{T}}$ be a $\mathtt{G}$-adapted history and $\varphi \in \mathbf{IE}(\mathtt{L}^{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathtt{G}))$. Then, the ***interpretation*** of φ with the history $\mathbf{h}$ is a $\mathtt{G}$-adapted stochastic process

$$[\![\varphi]\!]_{\mathbf{h}} \in \mathtt{L}^{\mathcal{T}}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathtt{G})$$

defined recursively on the structure of **IE**-formula by:

(1) $[\![m_1 \leq m_2]\!]_{\mathbf{h}}(t) := \mathbf{1}_{\{[\![m_1]\!](t) \leq [\![m_2]\!](t)\}}$,
(2) $[\![\neg\varphi]\!]_{\mathbf{h}} := 1 - [\![\varphi]\!]_{\mathbf{h}}$,
(3) $[\![\varphi \wedge \psi]\!]_{\mathbf{h}} := [\![\varphi]\!]_{\mathbf{h}} \wedge [\![\psi]\!]_{\mathbf{h}}$,
(4) $[\![\mathbf{K}_i\varphi]\!]_{\mathbf{h}}(t) := \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{h}(i)(t)}}\big[[\![\varphi]\!]_{\mathbf{h}}(t) \mid \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{h}(i)(t)}\big]$,
(5) $[\![\mathbf{B}_i\varphi]\!]_{\mathbf{h}}(t) := \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{h}(i)(t)}}\big[[\![\varphi]\!]_{\mathbf{h}}(t) \mid \mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{h}(i)(t)}\big]$,
(6) $[\![\mathbf{CK}_G\varphi]\!]_{\mathbf{h}}$ is a maximal fixed point f of the equation:

$$f(t) = \mathbb{E}^{\rho}\big[\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{h}(\cdot)(t)}}\big[f(t) \wedge [\![\varphi]\!]_{\mathbf{h}}(t) \mid \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{h}(\cdot)(t)}\big], G\big] \tag{5.1}$$

for all $t \in \mathcal{T}$,

(7) $[\![\mathbf{CB}_G\varphi]\!]_{\mathbf{h}}$ is a maximal fixed point f of the equation:

$$f(t) = \mathbb{E}^{\rho}\big[\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{h}(\cdot)(t)}}\big[f(t) \wedge [\![\varphi]\!]_{\mathbf{h}}(t) \mid \mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{h}(\cdot)(t)}\big], G\big] \tag{5.2}$$

for all $t \in \mathcal{T}$.

In order to guarantee the existence of the fixed point solution of (5.1), let us think the following sequence of processes $f_n : \mathcal{T} \times \Omega \to [0,1]$ defined by

(1) $f_0(t)(\omega) := 1$,
(2) $f_{n+1}(t) = \mathbb{E}^{\rho}\big[\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{h}(\cdot)(t)}}\big[f_n(t) \wedge [\![\varphi]\!]_{\mathbf{h}}(t) \mid \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{h}(\cdot)(t)}\big], G\big]$ for $n \in \mathtt{N}$.

Then, obviously $\{f_n\}_{n\in\mathtt{N}}$ is a non-increasing sequence in $[0,1]^{\mathcal{T}\times\Omega}$. So, it has a limit, which is easily proved to be a maximal fixed point of (5.1).

The existence of (5.2) is guaranteed by the same reason.

Definition 5.5. [ε-validity of **IE** formulae] Let $\varepsilon \in [0,1]$.

(1) $i, \omega, t \models_{\varepsilon} \varphi \;\Leftrightarrow\; \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{h}(i)(t)}}\big[[\![\varphi]\!]_{\mathbf{h}}(t) \mid \mathcal{K}_{\mathbf{h}(i)(t)}\big](\omega) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$,

(2) $i, \omega, t \models \varphi \;\Leftrightarrow\; i, \omega, t \models_0 \varphi$.

Note 5.6. In general, we cannot prove that

$$i, \omega, t \models \mathbf{K}_j\varphi \to \mathbf{B}_j\varphi \tag{5.3}$$

since the implementations of $\mathbf{K}_j\varphi$ and $\mathbf{B}_j\varphi$ are using conditional expectations instead of using sup operations, failing to have some monotonicity.

If we really insist on (5.3), we may need to assume that the cardinality of Ω is finite, which is not so interesting from a measure-theoretic point of view.

6. Concluding Remarks

The version of this paper is obviously a very starting point of the trial to utilize *belief* for analyzing stochastic jumps.

We introduced a language and its model. The language can represent some financial situations like the following and provided a model to interpret them.

$$i, \omega, t \models_{0.05} (\mathbf{B}_j(X(\nu) \geq p)) \wedge (\mathbf{B}_k(X(\nu) \leq p)),$$
$$i, \omega, t \models_{0.1} \mathbf{CB}_G(V(\nu + 1) \geq \ell).$$

The model of the language can treat full theory of stochastic processes based on measure theory so that one can apply several results in mathematical finance theory we have developed for the further analyses.

In the future research, we have two directions, practical and theoretical issues.

As the practical issue, we should write code for computing agents' beliefs from which we can derive the timing of stochastic jumps in some structural way. And then, we investigate more concrete examples aiming applications to finance theory.

As the theoretical issue, we should make a thorough investigation around (5.3). It is also worth to think a possibility to introduce a *public announcement* operator that is quite popular in Epistemic logic and is corresponding to a filtration enlargement.

References

[Ada14] Takanori Adachi, *Toward categorical risk measure theory*, Theory and Applications of Categories **29** (2014), no. 14, 389–405.

[FS11] Hans Föllmer and Alexander Schied, *Stochastic finance*, 3rd ed., Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 2011.

[Gil09] Itzhak Gilboa, *Theory of decision under uncertainty*, Econometric Society Monographs, no. 45, Cambridge University Press, 2009.

[Hin62] Jaakko Hintikka, *Knowledge and belief*, Cornell University Press, 1962.

[Mac97] Saunders MacLane, *Categories for the working mathematician*, 2nd ed., Graduate Texts in Mathematics, no. 5, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1997.

[Sik69] Roman Sikorski, *Boolean algebras*, 3rd ed., Springer-Verlag, 1969.

[vB11] Johan van Benthem, *Logical dynamics of information and interaction*, Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Department of Mathematical Sciences, Ritsumeikan University, 1-1-1 Nojihigashi, Kusatsu, Shiga, 525-8577 Japan

E-mail address: taka.adachi@gmail.com